

distinguishing over the multi-piece construction disclosed by Sleasman.

Sleasman's base 32 is described as follows:

"In the preferred embodiment, each of the aforementioned components, i.e., upper tank portion 14, lower tank portion 16, transition section 18, lid assembly 22, *and base 32* are separately constructed and attachable to one another via various methods which will later be described in detail."

Sleasman describes the manufacturer of some of his sections in more detail. He states that column 6, line 62:

"Preferably any transition section 18 is manufactured by using an injection molded method of manufacture."

The patent describes "numerous techniques" for joining thermol plastic materials such as high density polyethylene, of which the upper tank portion, lower tank portion, transition section and base 32 are preferably composed. Resistive welding and inductive welding are mentioned as is the use of adhesives.

These bonding techniques and the separate manufacture of the components of the grinder pumps station are required because of the configuration of the station, which makes it impossible to manufacture by blow molding. While blow molding is not part of Claims 1 or 20, the claimed sewage injector basin can, unlike the pump station described by Sleasman, be manufactured by blow molding which is a distinct advantage. None of Sleasman, Hoffman or Sidaway shows or describes a one-piece basin body as claimed and therefore none is capable of being manufactured by the less expensive blow molding process.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Sleasman. The examiner suggests that employing tapered walls in Sleasman would be an obvious design expedient. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The components of Sleasman's station are described in the patent in some detail. The tank portions 14 and 16 are described as substantially cylindrical, having a non-corrugated inner wall secured to a substantially cylindrical corrugated outer wall. The corrugated configuration is manufactured by the extrusion method. Applicant respectfully submits that if Sleasman's walls were tapered as claimed,

they could not be manufactured in the manner described by Sleasman. Because the examiner's suggested modification of Sleasman would make it impossible to manufacture the parts in the manner described by Sleasman, it cannot be said to be an obvious design expedient.

Claims 4 and 5 relate to the inlet opening, or nub of applicant's invention. Claim 1 now recites a one-piece molded base and body and Claim 4 requires that the nub be integral with the one-piece body and project from the outer surface of the generally cylindrical wall for connection to a sewage sourceline. The nub or pipe section 36 of Sidaway is a separate element that employs an inwardly extending annular collar 34 to receive the inlet structure 36. This is neither one piece nor integrally formed and therefore does not render Claims 4 or 5 obvious.

Claims 20-34, 27 and 28 are rejected as unpatentable over Sleasman in view of Hoffman. The examiner recognizes that Sleasman does not show an annular flat upper surface inside of which the upper lid assembly 22 fits, and cites Hoffman for this. However, the claim requires more. The claim requires a top cover for covering the open top, and our lower edge surface of the top cover being sealingly engageable with the flat annular region of the base, base and body further comprising a raised annular edge, *circumferentially surrounding the flat annular region and the outer edges of the top cover when engaged with the base and body*. Hoffman does not show or describe the cover at all and there is no suggestion that the raised annular edge would circumferentially surround the flat annular region and the outer edges of the top cover as claimed.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sleasman in view of Hoffman and Sidaway for the some reasons set forth for the earlier claims. To the extent that these rejections have already been addressed, they will not be repeated here except to note that in addition to the failure of the references individually or in accommodations already addressed, to show or suggest applicant's invention, there is no suggestion whatsoever in the references, and the examiner has posited no suggestion for combining the three of them.

Applicant appreciates the indication that Claims 10 through 17 are allowed. Applicant has put Claim 25 in independent form. Claim 26 depends

from new independent Claim 25 and is allowable. Applicant has put Claim 30 in independent form and it is now allowable.

Each of the matters raised in the office action having been addressed, reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen B. Salai
Registration No. 26,990

Dated: November 3, 2000

RECEIVED
NOV 16 2000
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM